

the part of the Justice Department, will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. ASHBROOK,
Representative to Congress, 17th District.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., December 8, 1967.

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in response to your letter of November 15, 1967, in which you quote from a letter of William B. Macomber, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, concerning testimony of Messrs. Reilly and Hill before the Senate Internal Securities Subcommittee.

Instances of possible perjury before a committee of Congress are brought to the attention of the Department of Justice for review and prosecutive determination by direct referral from the Congressional committee before which the testimony was given. Having searched our files and discussed this matter with Mr. Macomber, I can advise you that his information apparently is in error. There has been no such referral of the transcript of the testimony of Messrs. Reilly and Hill to this Department for review and recommendation on possible perjury charges.

Sincerely,

FRED M. VINSON, JR.
Assistant Attorney General.

[From Government Employees Exchange,
Sept. 18, 1968]

CHARGES AGAINST REILLY, BELISLE, HILL NOT
TO BE PRESSED BY JUSTICE, VINSON INFORMS
CLARK

In a response to an inquiry made by Senator Joseph Clark for a constituent in Upper Darby, Pennsylvania, Fred M. Vinson, Jr., Assistant Attorney General, indicated that the Department of Justice would not press perjury charges against John F. Reilly, David I. Belisle, and Elmer D. Hill growing out of their testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1963.

The three men figure prominently in the Otto F. Otepka case. Senator Strom Thurmond by letter earlier this year had asked the Department to review the testimony given by the three men after it was disclosed that they had altered it at the hearings of the former top Security Evaluator at the Department of State. Mr. Otepka's appeal for reinstatement is now before the Civil Service Commission's Board of Appeals and Reviews. Mr. Thurmond's request was rejected at that time by Mr. Vinson on the contention that the Department couldn't act unless it was instructed to do so by a congressional committee. A resolution adopted by the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security on June 5, this year, initiated the review.

Below appears a partial text of the August 21, 1968, letter addressed to Senator Clark by Mr. Vinson:

"Our examination of the record of the subcommittee's hearings, consisting of 1806 pages in twenty parts, indicated that testimony given by these individuals in July and August 1963 (Hill—July 9, 1963; Belisle—July 29, 1963; and Reilly—August 6, 1963) was substantially modified in later appearances before the committee in November 1963.

"Making the assumption that the earlier testimony was not truthful, we concluded that the matter did not merit presentation to a grand jury at this late date.

"The mere fact of contradictory statements under oath is not enough to establish perjury under the special rule applicable to perjury prosecutions. In view of the corrective testimony of the witnesses subsequent to their initial testimony, the case would have presented grave difficulties before a jury.

"Moreover, under the decisions of the District of Columbia Circuit where this prosecu-

tion would lie, prosecution might have already been impossible because of the lapse of time between the 1963 statements and the present time. The rule in that Circuit is that substantial delay may be a violation of the Constitutional right to a speedy trial even if the prosecution is brought within the period of limitations. United States v. Parrott, 248 F. Supp. 196 (1965).

"Sincerely,

"FRED M. VINSON, JR.
"Assistant Attorney General."

AMERICA'S INCREDIBLE ATTORNEY GENERAL

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 1968

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, my newsletter follows:

AMERICA'S INCREDIBLE ATTORNEY GENERAL

During his five years in office, LBJ has made some startling appointments, but the most bizarre of all has turned out to be Attorney General Ramsey Clark.

If there is one place in this country that we need a hard-nosed, no nonsense person it is in the Attorney General's office.

An effective, hard-hitting Attorney General could lead the anti-crime crusade in this nation and be a rallying point for our harassed and maligned police departments.

A tough Attorney General could also press the prosecution of those in organized crime, communist agitators who travel state to state stirring up riots, and those who break other Federal laws.

But, Clark has turned out to be super-soft on law enforcement and has actually denied there is a crime wave in this country.

And, incredibly, Clark seems more worried about "police violence" than the fact that in most cities in the United States it isn't safe on the street at night.

Clark testified recently here that "of all violence, police violence in excess of authority is the most dangerous. For who will protect the public when the police violate the law?"

Clark completely ignores the fact that violent crimes have increased 73% during the years since 1960.

And, while Clark sets up our police departments as the "bogymen" to watch out for, he even goes further in condemning American society as one "that celebrates the power of violence."

At the same hearing in which Clark delivered his attack on the American police departments, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover stoutly defended our police, saying:

"The violence of the criminal, often cold-blooded and calculated, is especially felt by law-enforcement officers. Crime and violence are increasing primarily because there is a mass deterioration in the respect shown for the rule of law in our nation and for some who enforce it. Heightening the atmosphere of resentment of authority and irresponsibility to others in our society is an all-too-prevalent defiance of duly established laws and rules that is euphemistically termed 'civil disobedience.' The demagogic exhortations of a number of civil rights, peace, and student leaders have done much to encourage and condone lawlessness and civil disobedience."

I believe the American people will take the word of J. Edgar Hoover over LBJ's bleeding-heart Attorney General who worries more about the police, than the fact that our cities have been wracked by riots, crime is out of control and communist-incited riots and demonstrations have become common place.

When Clark made his incredible attack on the police, we checked a local Washington, D.C. newspaper that week, to find out how bad the police were "misbehaving."

We couldn't find any accounts of police brutality, but we did note that:

1. Mayor Walter E. Washington of Washington, D.C., was victimized by a burglar in his bedroom. The mayor chased him out, but lost \$70 and his wallet.

2. Two university coeds were approached by five thugs while walking near the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, in a fashionable neighborhood. One girl was slugged and robbed of \$20, the other was raped.

3. A gunman kidnaped and assaulted a 24-year-old nurse near Dupont Circle.

4. Five bandits robbed a Washington bank of about \$22,000 then traded shots with the manager of a neighboring store as they fled. From across the street, students at an elementary school lined classroom windows to watch the action.

5. In suburban Washington, two men took \$3,477 from a chain food store—but were wounded and captured in a gun battle with police.

This was a typical day in the nation's capital, where the United States Attorney General sits in his office and worries about "police violence."

A church within two blocks of the Capitol dome has had to close its doors during all hours but when services are in progress, because of vandalism and theft. At the same church, a woman was stabbed at the altar while praying.

LBJ should fire Ramsey Clark immediately and appoint someone that at least recognizes the problem.

Czech

THE CRISIS IN EASTERN EUROPE

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1968

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues, ably led by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, in discussing the steadily worsening situation in east-central Europe as a result of the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia and diplomatic and military threats against the German Federal Republic and the dissident Communist states of Rumania and Yugoslavia.

The tragic fate of Czechoslovakia remains permanently bleak in view of its occupation by more than 500,000 troops of the Soviet Union which cannot be counterbalanced by any passive resistance or tenacity on the part of the Government and the population. Step by step, the present leadership will probably be purged. Foreign Minister Hajek, Deputy Prime Minister Sik, and Interior Minister Pavel, for example, have already been removed. The collaborationists will thus accede to power helped by intrigues and the feeling of hopelessness that will slowly grip the peoples of that central European state. The tactics used in Hungary during and after the November 1956 period are being repeated in Prague with only small differences.

A state which has to accept foreign occupation troops on its territory obviously cannot exercise its full sovereignty. The Hungarian people certainly harbor no ill feelings against the Dubcek regime in Czechoslovakia. As a matter of fact the Dubcek regime was the first one which

has allowed free expression to the Hungarian minority of Slovakia and promised settlement of some of their legitimate grievances. Even the Fock-Kadar government apparently felt some sympathies especially in view of the similarities of the Hungarian and Czechoslovak economic reforms. Writing in the New York Times of September 20, 1969, with Budapest dateline, Alvin Shuster reports:

Four of the five countries that sent troops a month ago this week Hungary seems the most shy and embarrassed about it.

Western diplomats are convinced that Hungary—where a rebellion was crushed by Russian troops 12 years ago—was the reluctant partner in a decision that is not being defended with any great conviction in the press here.

"There is no doubt that the decision is still viewed here with sadness and shame to a large extent," said one.

A Communist source close to the Government put it this way: "I would say that the number of people happy about it is insignificant. No socialist country likes to put troops into another . . ."

"I think it all means that the vote for sending troops in, if there was one, was 4/4 in favor," one diplomat said . . .

There are some who argue that Mr. Kadar really felt that Mr. Dubcek was moving too far too fast. But the more general assumption among diplomats is that Mr. Kadar had no choice given his economic dependence upon the Soviet Union, which also happens to have 40,000 troops on Hungarian soil.

The Russian moves are planned for wider objectives than just the suppression of "heretical" ideas of freedom in Communist Czechoslovakia. Already there is a diversionary political and psychological offensive against the German Federal Republic. The potential danger of 24 extra Russian divisions in Czechoslovakia to NATO security in the central section calls for immediate steps, political and military, over and beyond the returning of 12,000 American troops. A NATO summit is called for to decide how to strengthen best NATO militarily and politically.

Under these circumstances it is small wonder that Bonn regards President Johnson's desire to do disarmament business with Soviet Premier Aleksei Kosygin at this time as little short of betrayal. The mirage of detente dies hard, but we must face up to the changed realities in east-central Europe in order to avoid reckless Soviet moves which can lead to the danger of a world conflagration. Only from a position of strength and with determined tenacity can we later negotiate with the Soviets. Right now, the time has come for countermeasures rather than for talks.

In order to analyze the disturbing political and strategic potentialities of the new situation and to help arrive at adequate policies, I am joining my colleagues in calling for a comprehensive study of the situation in eastern and central Europe by the House Foreign Affairs Committee including public hearings and the completion of an independent study by outside academic and political experts. Former Vice President Nixon is undertaking a similar task as the Republican presidential candidate, but we in Congress must also face up to the changing conditions and continue their study in order to fulfill the trust our constituents have placed in us.

Mr. Speaker, I include herewith the editorial written by the Earl of Avon—former Prime Minister Anthony Eden—for the New York Times, September 14, 1968:

THE MESSAGE OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA
(By Anthony Eden, Earl of Avon)

Thirty years ago the Munich agreement left a weakened Czechoslovakia little chance of survival. Russian spokesmen have often denounced that agreement and its consequences. Now Czechoslovakia is occupied by military force once again, this time by its ally and big brother in Communism and in the Warsaw Pact, Soviet Russia. The unprovoked harshness of this deed has aroused indignation in the free world and in the Communist world also.

The judgment of the Yugoslav newspaper Politika merits quotation:

"Never, in the postwar period, has the tragedy of a country so deeply and so painfully shaken the world of our planet as has the tragedy sustained by Czechoslovakia. Never before was the world so united in the condemnation of the aggression as it is these days."

Czechoslovakia is the first casualty. This land which looked for freedom is now a land of fear. Though still a Communist state and loyal member of the Warsaw Pact, it is helpless before Russian armor and the still more dreaded secret police.

We must cherish no illusions. Repression has come again and with it the terror of the knock on the door in the dead of the night. All this for no crime, except that the Czechoslovak Communist leaders sought, with the full support of their people, to practice a little more freedom than the rulers of Russia were prepared to permit, so sharp was the fear of contagion.

There are other casualties. International Communism is split wide open, the greater part of it siding with Czechoslovakia at the first shock, even though the temptation to palliate the deed may grow with the passage of time.

No less significant is the impact upon hopes of negotiation in Europe. At intervals since the summit conference in Geneva, in the summer of 1955, efforts have been made to get discussions going with the purpose of agreeing to some mutual reduction in the number of troops, perhaps determining their location and even considering the possibility of a neutral zone.

REDUCING ARMED FORCES

At times during the Bulganin-Khrushchev era some progress on these lines seemed possible. Now not only these but other attempts at negotiation between Moscow and the West must be ruled out, unless one condition is first fulfilled. The Soviet armies must be withdrawn from Czechoslovak soil and that country's government allowed to function free from the imposition of foreign nominees or dictated censorship.

This is the indispensable minimum, for all negotiation must rest on confidence, and there can be none in the conditions which Russia has imposed upon Czechoslovakia. To condone what has happened would be base; it would also be foolish. The history of the thirties has taught us mercilessly that to attempt new agreements, while ignoring flagrant breaches of the old, earns contempt, not progress.

The record of attempted negotiation with Hitler and Mussolini cannot be ignored. There have also been more recent examples of appeasement with its predictable consequences.

When Sukarno claimed Western New Guinea, to which he had no right either ethically or ethnically, and threatened attack upon its territory, pressure was applied upon the responsible power to yield. It was no doubt expected that, satisfied with this notable concession, the Indonesian dictator would rest content. As usual, the reverse

proved the truth and Sukarno was soon claiming Malaysia.

"Confrontation" followed, which Malaysia, with the help of her ally, successfully repelled at a heavy cost, not least to Indonesia, which to this day is burdened by the aggressive adventures of her previous ruler.

There is a course for the free nations to follow. NATO should review its needs in the light of the changed conditions in Europe. That organization is essentially defensive and to improve its effectiveness can threaten no one. Admittedly the European nations would have to contribute to this effort, but it has to be made, for it would be irresponsible to ignore that the optimistic assumption of steadily improving relations across the Iron Curtain is now belied.

But this local action, though important, is not enough. The influence of Czechoslovakia's ordeal is already world-wide. Relations between the Communist powers have deteriorated sharply. The uncommitted nations are alarmed and acutely conscious of their uncertain future, while the smaller free nations are understandably anxious.

DUTY OF FREE NATIONS

In conditions where Communism's repute is much damaged, the leading free nations have both a duty and an opportunity. Together they should examine the existing situation in each continent, politically, militarily and economically. The purpose of this exercise would be to determine the wisest policies to be pursued in each of these spheres.

To make this effective, closer consultation would be necessary between the leading nations across the world. Something of the spirit of the earlier years of NATO would have to be rekindled for this more comprehensive work, but that is not impossible and the outcome could offer the leadership and inspiration which the world so sadly lacks.

No less important, a joint endeavor such as this could counter the world's greatest danger, the widening spread of anarchy.

MR. NIXON AND AMERICAN POPULATION GROWTH

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 1968

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, like millions of Americans, I have been entranced by the series of radio and television commercials promoting the presidential aspirations of Mr. Richard M. Nixon, as well as by news reports setting forth Mr. Nixon's prescriptions for the cure of America's ills as he dissects the American dilemma and subjects its bits and pieces to microscopic examination.

I must confess that I have learned to admire the objectivity of Mr. Nixon when, for example, he contrasts the economic stagnation of the Nixon-Eisenhower years with the historic growth of the gross national product with the unprecedented increase in the numbers of people gainfully employed and with the sharp decline in the unemployment rolls, which have characterized the past 7 years of Democratic administration.

I think that it is high time that some prominent national Republican figure, and I credit Mr. Nixon for taking the initiative in this respect, has called attention to the dismal failures of the likes of such as Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller and Mayor John V. Lindsay, Republicans